

REMARKS

Claims 8-14 are now pending. Claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,182,553 ("Kung") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,903 ("Abe et al."). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the following remarks.

I. CLAIMS 8-14 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER KUNG & ABE ET AL.

Claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by the combination of Kung and Abe et al. In support of the rejection, the Examiner notes that while "Kung does not explicitly disclose operating instructions, that are able to be acoustically displayed via an output device . . . in a similar field of endeavor, Abe is evidence of operating instructions, that are able to be acoustically displayed via an output device." It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are not rendered obvious by Kung and Abe et al. for at least the following reasons.

In order for a claim to be rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), not only must the prior art teach or suggest each element of the claim, the prior art must also suggest combining the elements in the manner contemplated by the claim. See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F. 2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990); In re Bond, 910 F. 2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The Examiner must show, *inter alia*, that there is some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify or combine the references, and that, when so modified or combined, the prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. See M.P.E.P. §2143. Applicant respectfully submits that neither of these criteria for obviousness are met here.

Claim 8 recites a “broadcast radio receiver set” that has “a memory for storing operating instructions that are capable of being retrieved, through input selection, in any desired section, and that are able to be at least acoustically displayed via an output device.” First, there is simply no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Kung with the teachings of Abe et al. While the Examiner states that the combination would have been obvious because the motivation for such combination “is clearly stated in Abe, which is to assist visually impaired persons,” there is simply no suggestion in Kung and Abe et al. that assistance for visually impaired persons is **desirable for the communications receiver disclosed in Kung**. Furthermore, while the Examiner contends that the fields of Kung and Abe et al. are “similar,” it is simply illogical to suggest that audio guidance technology (e.g., voiced data and instructions) contained in a portable financial IC card terminal as disclosed in Abe et al. is similar to the visual-display capability of a communications receiver as disclosed in Kung. It should be noted that Abe et al. reference teaches audio voice guidance for the terminal user to interface with, and operate, the terminal. (Col. 4, lines 50-54). While it may be logical for a portable financial IC card terminal to have the capability to deliver audio guidance as in Abe et al., it is simply illogical to incorporate an audio guidance capability for requesting search information from a user of a communications receiver as disclosed in Kung. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the combination asserted by the Examiner is not supported by the applied references, and the suggested combination is insufficient to support the obviousness rejection of claim 8.

Even if one assumed that there were some motivation to make the combination asserted by the Examiner, the suggested combination would still fail to approximate the claimed invention. As noted above, claim 8 recites a “broadcast radio receiver set” that has “a memory for storing operating instructions that are capable of being retrieved . . . and that are able to be at least acoustically displayed via an output device.” Abe et al. disclose output of audio guidance (e.g., voiced data and instructions) for a user of a portable financial IC card terminal to interface with and operate the terminal; Abe et al. does not provide **acoustic operating instructions**. This is a fundamental difference, because operating instructions provide the user with information which is independent of the state of the device, while the user audio guidance depends on the

instantaneous state of the device and only provides information regarding what the next operating step is. For these reasons, the suggested combination of Kung and Abe et al. would not render the subject matter of claim 8 obvious, and claim 8 is allowable over the applied references.

Claims 9-14, which depend from allowable claim 8, are similarly allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 8.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 8-14 be withdrawn.

II. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON

Dated: 3/26/02

By: for Richard L. Mayer

Richard L. Mayer
Reg. No. 22, 490

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646